



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,997	04/24/2000	Ganesh Venkataraman	M0656/7055 (HCL)	7686

23628 7590 09/21/2004

WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, PC
FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210-2211

EXAMINER

SMITH, CAROLYN L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1631

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 09/557,997	Applicant(s) VENKATARAMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Carolyn L Smith	Art Unit 1631	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 01 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 36,37 and 54-72.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Amending new claim limitations to "monosaccharides or disaccharides" and "wherein the polysaccharide is not a nucleic acid" as well as an added step (A) in proposed amended claim 36 raise new issues which would require further search and consideration. These proposed amendments do not place the application in better form for appeal.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: it raises new issues and will not be entered. Therefore, all objections and rejections stated in the FINAL action, mailed 4/30/04, are maintained.

Specification objection

If the proposed amendment had been entered, the objection to the specification would have been removed.

35 USC 101 rejection

If the proposed amendment had been entered, the 35 USC 101 rejection would be maintained as the proposed step (A) could be interpreted to take place on a computer which would lack any physical result performed outside of a computer. Applicants state proposed amended claim 36 involves a user providing information; however, no "user" is stated in the added limitation. Therefore, a computer or processor providing a value is a reasonable interpretation of this proposed amended step (A) which would not remove the nonstatutory issue.

35 USC 112, 1st paragraph, rejection

If the proposed amendment had been entered, the NEW MATTER rejections would have been removed.

35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, rejection

If the proposed amendment had been entered, the 112, 2nd rejection would have been removed.

35 USC 102 rejection

If the proposed amendment had been entered, the 102 rejection anticipated by Claverie et al. would have been removed. However, further consideration would be required to determine if other prior art could be used to anticipate the instant invention.

Ardin H. Marschel 9/17/04
ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER